Quasi-invariance of the stochastic flow associated to Itô's SDE with singular time-dependent drift

Dejun Luo*

Institute of Applied Mathematics, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

arXiv:1401.1884v1 [math.PR] 9 Jan 2014

Abstract

In this paper we consider the Itô SDE

$$dX_t = dW_t + b(t, X_t)\,dt, \quad X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where W_t is a d-dimensional standard Wiener process and the drift coefficient $b : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ belongs to $L^q(0,T;L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with $p \geq 2, q > 2$ and $\frac{d}{p}+\frac{2}{q} < 1$. In 2005, Krylov and Röckner [10] proved that the above equation has a unique strong solution X_t. Recently it was shown by Fedrizzi and Flandoli [6] that the solution X_t is indeed a stochastic flow of homeomorphisms on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We prove in the present work that the Lebesgue measure is quasi-invariant under the flow X_t.

MSC2000: 60H10

Key words: Stochastic differential equation, strong solution, flow of homeomorphisms, quasi-invariance, Zvonkin-type transformation

1 Introduction

Let $\sigma : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^m \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be measurable functions, and W_t a standard Wiener process in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Consider the Itô SDE

$$dX_t = \sigma(t, X_t)\,dW_t + b(t, X_t)\,dt, \quad X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.1}$$

It is a classical result that if the coefficients σ and b are globally Lipschitz continuous with respect to the spatial variable (uniformly in t), then the solution X_t to (1.1) constitutes a stochastic flow of homeomorphisms. In the past years, weaker conditions on the modulus of continuity of σ and b, such as log-Lipschitz continuity [2, 17], have been found which still ensure the existence of a flow of homeomorphisms.

When the diffusion coefficient σ is uniformly non-degenerate, the equation (1.1) may have pathwise uniqueness under quite weak conditions on the drift b. The first result in this direction is due to Veretennikov [16], which says that if $\sigma(t,\cdot)$ is bounded Lipschitz continuous and satisfies a non-degeneracy condition, then the SDE (1.1) admits a unique strong solution once b is bounded measurable. In [9], Gyöngy and Martinez generalized this result to the case where $\sigma(t,\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, and the drift coefficient b is dominated by the sum of a positive constant and an integrable function. Their method relies on a convergence result of the solutions of approximating SDEs to that of the limiting SDE, which follows from the Krylov estimate. X.

*Email: luodj@amss.ac.cn. Partly supported by the Key Laboratory of RCSDS, CAS (2008DP173182), NSFC (11101407) and AMSS (Y129161ZZ1)

Zhang improved their results in [18] by replacing the locally Lipschitz continuity of $\sigma(t,\cdot)$ with some integrability condition.

In the influential paper [10], Krylov and Röckner considered the case where $\sigma \equiv Id$ (the identity matrix of order d, hence W_t is now a d-dimensional standard Wiener process) and the drift $b : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies

$$\int_0^T \bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |b(t,x)|^p \, dx \bigg)^{\frac{q}{p}} dt < +\infty \tag{1.2}$$

with $p \geq 2, q > 2$ such that

$$\frac{d}{p} + \frac{2}{q} < 1. \tag{1.3}$$

Hence the Itô SDE becomes

$$dX_t = dW_t + b(t, X_t)\, dt, \quad X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.4}$$

They proved that the above equation has a unique strong solution by using Yamada–Watanabe's criterion: existence of weak solution plus pathwise uniqueness implies the existence of a unique strong solution. The regularity properties of functions in the Sobolev space $H^q_{2,p}(T)$ (see the next section for its definition) play an important role in the proof of pathwise uniqueness of (1.4). Recently, Fedrizzi and Flandoli proved that the solution X_t is indeed a stochastic flow of homeomorphisms on $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see [6, Theorem 1.2]). Moreover, when $v_0 \in \cap_{r\geq 1} W^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, they showed in [5] that $v(t,x) := v_0\big(X_t^{-1}(x)\big)$ is the unique weakly differentiable solution to the SPDE

$$dv + \langle b, \nabla v\rangle\, dt + \langle \nabla v, dW_t\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\Delta v\, dt, \quad v|_{t=0} = v_0,$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (cf. [15] for related studies). When the dimension $d = 1$ and the drift b is time-independent, Aryasovay and Pilipenko [1] obtained the Sobolev regularity of the flow X_t under the assumptions that b has linear growth and locally finite variation. We mention that similar problems were studied in [7] when $b \in L^\infty(0,T; C_b^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d))$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ (cf. [8] for non-constant diffusion coefficients). X. Zhang proved in [20] the stochastic homeomorphism flow property for the SDE (1.1) with uniformly non-degenerate diffusion coefficient.

Our purpose in the present work is to show that the Lebesgue measure is quasi-invariant under the flow X_t generated by (1.4) with b satisfying (1.2). Here the quasi-invariance means that, almost surely, the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure by the flow is equivalent to itself. Recall that Fedrizzi and Flandoli [4] proved in this case that, almost surely, $X_t \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$; moreover, the flow X_t is weakly differentiable in the following sense (cf. [6, Theorem 1.2]): for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the limit

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{X_\cdot(x + he_i) - X_\cdot(x)}{h}$$

exists in $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T], \mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\{e_1, \ldots, e_d\}$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. However, these regularity properties of the flow X_t are not sufficient to conclude that the Lebesgue measure is quasi-invariant under the action of X_t. We would like to mention that the existence and uniqueness of generalized stochastic flow associated to SDEs with coefficients in Sobolev spaces are studied in [19, 3, 21, 14], showing that the reference measure is quasi-invariant under the flow when the divergence and gradient of coefficients fulfill suitable (exponential) integrability.

To state the main result of this work, we denote by L^d the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $(X_t)_\# \mathrm{L}^d := \mathrm{L}^d \circ X_t^{-1}$ the push-forward of L^d by the flow X_t.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $b : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a time-dependent vector field such that* (1.2) *holds with $p \geq 2$ and $q > 2$ satisfying* (1.3)*. Then for all $t \in [0,T]$, $(X_t)_{\#}\text{Ł}^d$ is equivalent to Ł^d almost surely; in other words, the Lebesgue measure is quasi-invariant under the stochastic flow X_t of homeomorphisms generated by* (1.4)*.*

We point out that it is indeed not difficult to show that, almost surely, the push-forward $(X_t)_{\#}\text{Ł}^d$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Ł^d, based on the estimates in [5, Lemmas 3 and 5] (see the proof of Proposition 3.1 in the current paper). The difficult part lies in the proof of that the Radon–Nikodym density $K_t := \frac{d(X_t)_{\#}\text{Ł}^d}{d\text{Ł}^d}$ is everywhere positive, that is, the two measures are equivalent. To achieve this purpose, we shall make use of the Zvonkin-type transformation introduced in [5] to get a new SDE which has more regular coefficients. We first prove that the Lebesgue measure is quasi-invariant under the flow generated by this SDE, then we transfer the quasi-invariance property to the original flow X_t. Using this method, we do not need the existence of generalized divergence of the drift b, in contrast to [13, Theorem 1.1]. The same idea does work to extend our result to the more general case studied by X. Zhang [20] (of course, we have to extend [5, Lemmas 3 and 5] to this setting). We don't want to do such technical extensions in this short note.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we recall some known results which are critical for proving Theorem 1.1. In particular, we introduce the Zvonkin-type transformation (also called Itô–Tanaka trick) used by Fedrizzi and Flandoli [5, 6] to prove the existence of unique strong solution to (1.4). Following the ideas in [12, 19], we first prove in Section 3 the quasi-invariance of the flow Y_t which is the strong solution to the transformed SDE (2.7), then we transfer this property to the solution X_t through a C^1-diffeomorphism.

2 Notations and preliminary results

In this section we first introduce some notations of function spaces and then collect some known results which are crucial for our paper. The main references are [5, 6].

For $p \geq 1$, $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the usual space of (possibly vector-valued) functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which are Lebesgue integrable of order p. Let $f(t,x)$ be a function of time and space, we will use superscripts to characterize the time-part of the norm and subscripts for the space-part: we will have $L^q_p(S,T) = L^q(S,T;L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))$. For simplicity, $L^q_p(T) := L^q_p(0,T)$. We also need some notations of Sobolev spaces: $W^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the usual Sobolev space, and

$$\mathbb{H}^q_{\alpha,p}(T) = L^q(0,T;W^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)), \quad \mathbb{H}^{\beta,q}_p(T) = W^{\beta,q}(0,T;L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

Finally, $H^q_{\alpha,p}(T) = \mathbb{H}^q_{\alpha,p}(T) \cap \mathbb{H}^{1,q}_p(T)$.

Now we state the following result concerning the existence and uniqueness of weak solutions to (1.4) (cf. [6, Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.6]).

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $b \in L^q_p(T)$ with p, q satisfying* (1.3)*. Then*

(i) *for fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exist processes X_t, W_t defined for $t \in [0,T]$ on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ such that W_t is a d-dimensional $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-Wiener process and X_t is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)$–adapted, continuous, d-dimensional process for which*

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^T |b(t,X_t)|^2 \, dt < \infty \bigg) = 1 \tag{2.1}$$

and almost surely, for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$X_t = x + W_t + \int_0^t b(s,X_s) \, ds.$$

(ii) *weak uniqueness holds for the equation* (1.4) *in the class of solutions satisfying* (2.1)*; moreover, if* $f \in L^{\tilde{q}}_{\tilde{p}}(T)$ *with* $\frac{d}{\tilde{p}} + \frac{2}{\tilde{q}} < 1$*, then for any* $k \in \mathbb{R}$*, there exists a constant* C_f *depending on* $\|f\|_{L^{\tilde{q}}_{\tilde{p}}(T)}$ *such that*

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}\Big[e^{k\int_0^T |f(t,X_t)|^2\,dt}\Big] \le C_f. \tag{2.2}$$

The next result (see [6, Theorem 3.3]) concerning the regularity of solutions to the backward parabolic system (2.3) plays an important role.

Theorem 2.2. *Let* $\lambda > 0$ *and* $p \ge 2, q > 2$ *such that* (1.3) *holds. Take two vector fields* $b, f \in L^q_p(T)$*. Then in* $H^q_{2,p}(T)$ *there exists a unique solution of the backward parabolic system*

$$\partial_t u + \frac{1}{2}\Delta u + b\cdot\nabla u - \lambda u + f = 0, \quad u(T,x) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, there exists a finite constant N *depending only on* d, p, q, T, λ *and* $\|b\|_{L^q_p(T)}$ *such that*

$$\|u\|_{H^q_{2,p}(T)} := \|\partial_t u\|_{L^q_p(T)} + \|u\|_{\mathbb{H}^q_{2,p}(T)} \le N\|f\|_{L^q_p(T)}. \tag{2.4}$$

We also have

Lemma 2.3. *Let* u_λ *be the solution of* (2.3)*. Then*

$$\sup_{t\le T}\|\nabla u_\lambda\|_\infty \to 0 \quad \text{as } \lambda\to\infty,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ *is the supremum norm in the space* $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *of continuous functions.*

In view of the above lemma, we fix $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t\le T}\|\nabla u_\lambda\|_\infty \le \frac{1}{2}. \tag{2.5}$$

Define

$$\phi_\lambda(t,x) = x + u_\lambda(t,x), \quad (t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d.$$

The properties of the map ϕ_λ are collected in the next proposition (cf. [6, Lemma 3.5]).

Proposition 2.4. *The following statements hold:*

(i) *uniformly in* $t\in[0,T]$*,* $\phi_\lambda(t,\cdot)$ *has bounded first derivatives which are Hölder continuous;*

(ii) *for every* $t\in[0,T]$*,* $\phi_\lambda(t,\cdot)$ *is a* C^1*-diffeomorphism on* $\mathbb{R}^d$*;*

(iii) $\phi^{-1}_\lambda(t,\cdot) := (\phi_\lambda(t,\cdot))^{-1}$ *has bounded first spatial derivatives, uniformly in* t*;*

(iv) ϕ_λ *and* ϕ^{-1}_λ *are jointly continuous in* (t,x)*.*

We are now ready to state the Zvonkin-type transformation used in [7, 5, 6] to prove the existence of unique strong solution to Itô's SDE with irregular drift coefficient. Replacing f by b in the parabolic equation (2.3), that is, we consider

$$\partial_t u_\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\Delta u_\lambda + b\cdot\nabla u_\lambda = \lambda u_\lambda - b, \quad u_\lambda(T,x) = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

In the following we shall fix a $\lambda > 0$ such that (2.5) holds, and we omit the subscript λ to simplify notations. Denote by $\phi_t(x) = x + u(t,x)$, $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. By Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} du(t,X_t) &= \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,X_t)\,dt + \nabla u(t,X_t)(b(t,X_t)\,dt + dW_t) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta u(t,X_t)\,dt \\ &= \lambda u(t,X_t)\,dt - b(t,X_t)\,dt + \nabla u(t,X_t)\,dW_t. \end{aligned}$$

Define the new process $Y_t = \phi_t\big(X_t(\phi_0^{-1})\big) = X_t(\phi_0^{-1}) + u\big(t, X_t(\phi_0^{-1})\big)$. Then (we write X_t instead of $X_t(\phi_0^{-1})$ to save notations)

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t &= b(t,X_t)\,dt + dW_t + \lambda u(t,X_t)\,dt - b(t,X_t)\,dt + \nabla u(t,X_t)\,dW_t \\ &= \lambda u(t,X_t)\,dt + (Id + \nabla u(t,X_t))\,dW_t, \end{aligned}$$

where Id is the identity matrix of order d. Since ϕ_t is a C^1-diffeomorphism, we can define

$$\tilde\sigma(t,y) = Id + \nabla u\big(t, \phi_t^{-1}(y)\big), \quad \tilde b(t,y) = \lambda u\big(t, \phi_t^{-1}(y)\big), \quad (t,y) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Therefore Y_t satisfies the new Itô's SDE

$$dY_t = \tilde\sigma(t,Y_t)\,dW_t + \tilde b(t,Y_t)\,dt, \quad Y_0 = x. \tag{2.7}$$

We shall see in the next result that the coefficients of SDE (2.7) are more regular than those of (1.4), thus it is easier to be treated.

Proposition 2.5. *We have* $\nabla\tilde b \in C([0,T], C_b(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *and*

$$\tilde\sigma \in C([0,T], C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^q(0,T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

Based on the regularity of the coefficients $\tilde\sigma, \tilde b$ and applying Krylov-type estimates, Fedrizzi and Flandoli first proved the pathwise uniqueness of solutions to the equation (2.7), and then translated this result to the solution X_t of the original equation (1.4) via the transformation ϕ_t. Thus by Yamada–Watanabe's criterion, both equations (2.7) and (1.4) have a unique strong solution. The following theorem is the main result in [6] (see Theorem 1.2 there).

Theorem 2.6. *Under the assumption of Theorem 2.1, the equation* (1.4) *has a unique strong solution X_t which defines a stochastic flow of homeomorphisms and is α-Hölder continuous for every $\alpha < 1$.*

From Proposition 2.5 and Sobolev's embedding theorem, we see that, for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$, $\tilde\sigma(t,\cdot)$ is Hölder continuous of order $\theta < 1$. Therefore we cannot directly apply the classical results (see for instance [11, Lemma 4.3.1]) to conclude that the solution Y_t to (2.7) leaves the reference measure quasi-invariant. To show our main theorem, we need to do some approximation arguments. Here are the necessary preparations (see [5, Lemma 12]).

Lemma 2.7. *Let b^n be a sequence of smooth vector fields converging to b in $L_p^q(T)$, and u^n the solution to* (2.6) *with b replaced by b^n. Then we have*

(i) *$u^n(t,x)$ and $\nabla u^n(t,x)$ converge pointwise in (t,x) to $u(t,x)$ and $\nabla u(t,x)$ respectively, and the convergence is uniform on compact sets;*

(ii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|u^n - u\|_{H^q_{2,p}(T)} = 0$;

(iii) *there exists a λ for which* $\sup_{n\ge1} \sup_{t,x} |\nabla u^n(t,x)| \le \frac{1}{2}$;

(iv) $\sup_{n\geq 1}\|\nabla^2 u^n\|_{L^q_p(T)}\leq C$.

Let $Y^n_t(x)$ be the flow associated to (2.7) with the coefficients

$$\tilde{\sigma}^n(t,y)=Id+\nabla u^n(t,\phi^{n,-1}_t(y)),\quad \tilde{b}^n(t,y)=\lambda u^n(t,\phi^{n,-1}_t(y)), \tag{2.8}$$

where $\phi^n_t(x)=x+u^n(t,x)$. For $R>0$, B_R denotes the ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centered at the origin with radius R. We have

Proposition 2.8. *In the situation of Lemma 2.7, for every $R>0$ and $k\geq 2$, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{t\leq T}\sup_{x\in B_R}\mathbb{E}\big(|Y^n_t(x)-Y_t(x)|^k\big)=0.$$

The same convergence holds for the inverse flows $Y^{n,-1}_t$ and Y^{-1}_t. Moreover, there exists C_k independent on $n\geq 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg[\sup_{t\leq T}|Y^n_t(x)|^k\bigg]\leq C_k(1+|x|^k).$$

Proof. The first assertion was shown in the proof of [5, Lemma 3] (see p.1336), while the second one is a consequence of [5, Lemma 3] and the relation $Y^{n,-1}_t=\phi^n_0\big(X^{n,-1}_t(\phi^{n,-1}_t)\big)$, where X^n_t is the flow associated to (1.4) with b replaced by b_n, and $X^{n,-1}_t$ is its inverse flow. As for the last estimate, it is a slight improvement of [5, (26)] by removing $\sup_{t\leq T}$ into the expectation: this follows from the uniform growth of the coefficients $\tilde{\sigma}^n,\tilde{b}^n$ and classical moment estimates. □

3 Proof of the main result

In this section we first prove that the Lebesgue measure is quasi-invariant under the stochastic flow Y_t generated by the new equation (2.7), following the ideas in [12, 19]. Then we transfer this property to the solution X_t of the original SDE (1.4) by using the diffeomorphism $\phi_t: x\mapsto x+u(t,x)$, where u solves the parabolic equation (2.6).

We start by recalling the setting. Let $b:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^d$ be a time-dependent vector field verifying the assumption of Theorem 1.1, and $u(t,x)$ the solution to the parabolic system (2.6). The transformation ϕ_t and the coefficients $\tilde{\sigma},\tilde{b}$ are defined as in Section 2. As mentioned in the last section, the diffusion coefficient $\tilde{\sigma}$ of (2.7) is only Hölder continuous, which makes it impossible to directly apply the existing results to conclude the quasi-invariance of $Y_t:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore we take a sequence $\{b^n\}_{n\geq 1}$ of smooth vector fields with compact supports in $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|b^n-b\|_{L^q_p(T)}=0. \tag{3.1}$$

Denote by X^n_t the flow of diffeomorphisms generated by (1.4) with b replaced by b^n, and $X^{n,-1}_t$ its inverse flow. We include the following estimate which was proved in [5, Lemma 5]: for every $k\geq 1$,

$$\sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{t\leq T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\big(|\nabla X^{n,-1}_t(x)|^k\big)<+\infty. \tag{3.2}$$

Let u^n be the solution to (2.6) with b replaced by b^n. Then u^n is smooth with bounded derivatives (cf. [7, Theorem 2] where u^n has bounded derivatives up to order 2 when $b^n\in L^\infty(0,T;C^\alpha_b(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}^d))$; note that the parabolic equation (9) in [7] is not accompanied with the boundary condition $u(T,\cdot)=0$). By Lemma 2.7(iii), we shall fix λ big enough such that

$$\sup_{t\leq T}\|\nabla u(t,\cdot)\|_\infty\bigvee\sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{t\leq T}\|\nabla u^n(t,\cdot)\|_\infty\leq\frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.3}$$

Let $\tilde{\sigma}^n(t,y)$ and $\tilde{b}^n(t,y)$ be defined as in (2.8). We consider the Itô SDE

$$dY_t^n = \tilde{\sigma}^n(t, Y_t^n)\, dW_t + \tilde{b}^n(t, Y_t^n)\, dt, \quad Y_0^n = x.$$

Since the coefficients $\tilde{\sigma}^n(t,y)$ and $\tilde{b}^n(t,y)$ are smooth with bounded spatial derivatives, uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$, we know that Y_t^n is a flow of diffeomorphisms on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The inverse flow is denoted by $Y_t^{n,-1}$. Moreover, $Y_t^n = \phi_t^n\big(X_t^n(\phi_0^{n,-1})\big)$ with $\phi_t^n(x) = x + u^n(t,x)$.

In the sequel, we denote by $(Y_t^n)_{\#}\text{Ł}^d = \text{Ł}^d \circ Y_t^{n,-1}$ and $(Y_t^{n,-1})_{\#}\text{Ł}^d = \text{Ł}^d \circ Y_t^n$ the push-forwards of the Lebesgue measure Ł^d by the flows Y_t^n and $Y_t^{n,-1}$. Then it is well-known that

$$\rho_t^n := \frac{d(Y_t^n)_{\#}\text{Ł}^d}{d\text{Ł}^d} = \big|\det\big(\nabla Y_t^{n,-1}\big)\big| \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\rho}_t^n := \frac{d(Y_t^{n,-1})_{\#}\text{Ł}^d}{d\text{Ł}^d} = \big|\det\big(\nabla Y_t^n\big)\big|.$$

The following simple relation holds:

$$\rho_t^n(x) = \big[\bar{\rho}_t^n\big(Y_t^{n,-1}(x)\big)\big]^{-1}. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, by [11, Lemma 4.3.1] (see also [19, (2.2)]), the density function $\bar{\rho}_t^n$ has the following explicit expression:

$$\bar{\rho}_t^n(x) = \exp\bigg\{ \int_0^t \big\langle \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s, Y_s^n(x)), dW_s \big\rangle + \int_0^t \Big[\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n) - \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^* \rangle\Big](s, Y_s^n(x))\, ds \bigg\}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n) = \big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n_{\cdot,1}), \ldots, \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n_{\cdot,d})\big)$ is a vector-valued function whose components are the divergences of the column vectors of $\tilde{\sigma}^n$, and $\langle \nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^* \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{i,j=1}^d (\partial_i \tilde{\sigma}^n_{jk})(\partial_j \tilde{\sigma}^n_{ik})$. Next, noting that $x = \phi_t^n(\phi_t^{n,-1}(x)) = \phi_t^{n,-1}(x) + u^n(t, \phi_t^{n,-1}(x))$, thus

$$Id = \nabla\phi_t^{n,-1}(x) + \nabla u^n(t, \phi_t^{n,-1}(x)) \nabla\phi_t^{n,-1}(x).$$

As a result, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have by (3.3) that ($\|\cdot\|_{op}$ is the operator norm)

$$1 = \|Id\|_{op} \geq \big\|\nabla\phi_t^{n,-1}(x)\big\|_{op} - \big\|\nabla u^n(t, \phi_t^{n,-1}(x))\big\|_{op} \big\|\nabla\phi_t^{n,-1}(x)\big\|_{op} \geq \frac{1}{2}\big\|\nabla\phi_t^{n,-1}(x)\big\|_{op},$$

that is,

$$\sup_{t\leq T} \big\|\nabla\phi_t^{n,-1}(x)\big\|_{op} \leq 2. \tag{3.6}$$

Combining this estimate with (3.2) and the relation $Y_t^{n,-1} = \phi_0^n\big(X_t^{n,-1}(\phi_t^{n,-1})\big)$, we obtain

$$\sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{t\leq T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}\big(\rho_t^n(x)^k\big) = \sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{t\leq T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}\big(\big|\det\big(\nabla Y_t^{n,-1}(x)\big)\big|^k\big) < \infty, \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1. \tag{3.7}$$

Now we are ready to show that the Lebesgue measure is absolutely continuous under the action of the flow Y_t generated by (2.7).

Proposition 3.1 (Absolute continuity under the flow Y_t)**.** *Assume the condition of Theorem 1.1. Then for any $t \in [0,T]$, the push-forward $(Y_t)_{\#}\mathcal{L}^d$ of the Lebesgue measure is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{L}^d$. Moreover, the Radon–Nikodym density $\rho_t := \frac{d(Y_t)_{\#}\mathcal{L}^d}{d\mathcal{L}^d}$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{t\leq T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}\big(\rho_t(x)^k\big) < \infty, \quad \textit{for all } k \geq 1. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. Based on the estimate (3.7) and Proposition 2.8, this result is a consequence of [19, Lemma 3.5]. We include its proof here for the reader's convenience. Proposition 2.8 implies that, up to a subsequence, $Y_t^n(\omega,x)$ converges to $Y_t(\omega,x)$ for $(\mathbb{P}\otimes \text{Ł}^d)$-a.e. (ω,x) as $n\to\infty$. We fix any $N>0$ and let $C_N(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}_+)$ be the collection of nonnegative continuous functions with support in B_N. Then for any $\varphi\in C_N(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}_+)$, by Fubini's theorem and Fatou's lemma, it holds for a.s. $\omega\in\Omega$ that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(Y_t(x))\,dx\le\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(Y_t^n(x))\,dx=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(y)\rho_t^n(y)\,dy=:\liminf_{n\to\infty}J_\varphi^n(\omega).\tag{3.9}$$

By (3.7), there exists a subsequence still denoted by n and a $\rho_t^{(0)}\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d;L^k(\Omega))$ satisfying (3.8) such that

$$\rho_t^n \text{ weakly}* \text{ converges to } \rho_t^{(0)} \text{ in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d;L^k(\Omega)).$$

Since ρ_t^n also converges weakly to $\rho_t^{(0)}$ in $L^2(\Omega\times B_N)$, by Banach–Saks theorem, there is another subsequence still denoted by n such that its Cesàro mean $\hat\rho_t^n:=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n\rho_t^n$ converges strongly to $\rho_t^{(0)}$ in $L^2(\Omega\times B_N)$. Therefore, up to a subsequence, $\hat\rho_t^n(\omega)$ converges to $\rho_t^{(0)}(\omega)$ in $L^2(B_N)$ for a.s. ω. Hence

$$\hat J_\varphi^n(\omega):=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n J_\varphi^n(\omega)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(y)\hat\rho_t^n(\omega,y)\,dy\longrightarrow\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(y)\hat\rho_t^{(0)}(\omega,y)\,dy\quad\text{as } n\to\infty.$$

Combining this limit together with (3.9) gives us

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(Y_t(x))\,dx\le\liminf_{n\to\infty}J_\varphi^n(\omega)\le\lim_{n\to\infty}\hat J_\varphi^n(\omega)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(y)\hat\rho_t^{(0)}(\omega,y)\,dy.$$

The separability of $C_N(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}_+)$ implies that there is a common full set $\hat\Omega$ such that the above inequality holds for all $\omega\in\hat\Omega$ and $\varphi\in C_N(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}_+)$. Since $N>0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $(Y_t)_\#\text{Ł}^d$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Ł^d and the density function $\rho_t\le\hat\rho_t^{(0)}$. Hence the estimate (3.8) holds. □

To show that the push-forward $(Y_t)_\#\text{Ł}^d$ is in fact equivalent to Ł^d, we intend to give in the following an explicit expression for the Radon–Nikodym density ρ_t. To this end, we shall prove that the density functions $\bar\rho_t^n$ defined in (3.5) are convergent to

$$\bar\rho_t(x)=\exp\left\{\int_0^t\big\langle\text{div}(\tilde\sigma)(s,Y_s(x)),dW_s\big\rangle+\int_0^t\Big[\text{div}(\tilde b)-\frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla\tilde\sigma,(\nabla\tilde\sigma)^*\rangle\Big](s,Y_s(x))\,ds\right\}\tag{3.10}$$

in some sense. We need the technical result below.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $f\in L_{\tilde p}^{\tilde q}(T)$ with $\tilde p,\tilde q$ satisfying (1.3). Then for any $k\ge1$, there exists a constant $C_{k,f}$ depending on k and $\|f\|_{L_{\tilde p}^{\tilde q}(T)}$ such that*

$$\sup_{n\ge1}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\Big[e^{k\int_0^T|f(t,Y_t^n(x))|^2\,dt}\Big]\le C_{k,f}.$$

Proof. This result is a consequence of Theorem 2.1. Indeed, since X_t^n is the solution to (1.4) with b replaced by b^n, then (2.2) implies

$$\sup_{n\ge1}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\Big[e^{k\int_0^T|f(t,X_t^n(x))|^2\,dt}\Big]\le C_{k,f},\tag{3.11}$$

where $C_{k,f}$ depends on k and $\|f\|_{L^{\tilde{q}}_{\tilde{p}}(T)}$. Recall that Y^n_t is related to X^n_t by the diffeomorphism ϕ^n_t: $Y^n_t = \phi^n_t\big(X^n_t(\phi^{n,-1}_0)\big)$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[e^{k\int_0^T |f(t,Y^n_t(x))|^2\,dt}\Big] = \mathbb{E}\bigg[\exp\bigg(k\int_0^T \big|f\big(t,\phi^n_t\big[X^n_t(\phi^{n,-1}_0(x))\big]\big)\big|^2\,dt\bigg)\bigg].$$

Consider the new function $g^n(t,x) = f(t,\phi^n_t(x))$. By the change of variable,

$$\int_0^T\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|g^n(t,x)|^{\tilde{p}}dx\bigg)^{\frac{\tilde{q}}{\tilde{p}}}dt = \int_0^T\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f(t,y)|^{\tilde{p}}\big|\det\big(\nabla\phi^{n,-1}_t(y)\big)\big|dy\bigg)^{\frac{\tilde{q}}{\tilde{p}}}dt. \tag{3.12}$$

Inequality (3.6) implies

$$\sup_{n\geq1}\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}\big|\det\big(\nabla\phi^{n,-1}_t(y)\big)\big| < \infty,$$

which, together with (3.12), leads to

$$\sup_{n\geq1}\|g^n\|_{L^{\tilde{q}}_{\tilde{p}}(T)} < \infty.$$

Combining this estimate with (3.11) completes the proof. □

We now prove the following result which is analogous to [12, Lemma 3.5].

Lemma 3.3 (Uniform estimate of Radon–Nikodym densities)**.** *For any $k\in\mathbb{R}$, it holds*

$$\sup_{n\geq1}\sup_{t\leq T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\big[(\bar{\rho}^n_t(x))^k\big] < +\infty.$$

Proof. We denote by $\xi^n = \operatorname{div}(\tilde{b}^n) - \frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n,(\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^*\rangle$ to simplify notations. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(\bar{\rho}^n_t(x))^k &= \exp\bigg\{k\int_0^t\big\langle\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s,Y^n_s(x)),dW_s\big\rangle + k\int_0^t\xi^n(s,Y^n_s(x))\,ds\bigg\}\\ &= \exp\bigg\{k\int_0^t\big\langle\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s,Y^n_s(x)),dW_s\big\rangle - k^2\int_0^t|\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s,Y^n_s(x))|^2\,ds\bigg\}\\ &\quad\times\exp\bigg\{\int_0^t\big(k^2|\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)|^2 + k\xi^n\big)(s,Y^n_s(x))\,ds\bigg\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus by Cauchy's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\big[(\bar{\rho}^n_t(x))^k\big] &\leq \bigg(\mathbb{E}\exp\bigg\{2k\int_0^t\big\langle\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s,Y^n_s(x)),dW_s\big\rangle - 2k^2\int_0^t|\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s,Y^n_s(x))|^2\,ds\bigg\}\bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\quad\times\bigg(\mathbb{E}\exp\bigg\{2\int_0^t\big(k^2|\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)|^2+k\xi^n\big)(s,Y^n_s(x))\,ds\bigg\}\bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

By Novikov's criterion and Lemma 3.2, to show that the first exponential is a martingale, it suffices to prove that $\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)\in L^q_p(T)$. This is a consequence of Lemma 2.7(iv) and the definition of $\tilde{\sigma}^n$. Next by (3.3) and (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned}|\xi^n| \leq |\operatorname{div}(\tilde{b}^n)| + \frac{1}{2}|\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n,(\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^*\rangle| &\leq \lambda\|\nabla u^n(t,\cdot)\|_\infty\|\nabla\phi^{n,-1}_t\|_\infty + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n|^2\\ &\leq C_\lambda + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the second expectation in (3.13) is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\exp\left\{2\int_0^T\left(k^2|\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)|^2+|k\xi^n|\right)(s,Y_s^n(x))\,ds\right\}\\ &\leq e^{C_\lambda|k|T}\sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\exp\left\{(2k^2+|k|)\int_0^T\left|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n(s,Y_s^n(x))\right|^2 ds\right\}<\infty,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemmas 3.2 and 2.7(iv). □

Now we show that the three integrals in the bracket on the right hand side of (3.5) converge to the corresponding ones in (3.10). First we have

Proposition 3.4. *For any $R>0$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\left|\int_0^t\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n)(s,Y_s^n(x))\,ds-\int_0^t\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})(s,Y_s(x))\,ds\right|dx=0,$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\left|\int_0^t\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n,(\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^*\rangle(s,Y_s^n(x))\,ds-\int_0^t\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma},(\nabla\tilde{\sigma})^*\rangle(s,Y_s(x))\,ds\right|dx=0,$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\left|\int_0^t\left\langle\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s,Y_s^n(x)),dW_s\right\rangle-\int_0^t\left\langle\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma})(s,Y_s(x)),dW_s\right\rangle\right|dx=0.$$

Proof. The proofs of the three limits have some points in common, but there are minor differences that should be taken care of. We prove them separately.

(i) We denote by I_n the term on the left hand side of the first limit. Then

$$\begin{aligned}I_n&\leq\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_{B_R}\left|\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n)(s,Y_s^n(x))-\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})(s,Y_s^n(x))\right|dxds\\&\quad+\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_{B_R}\left|\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})(s,Y_s^n(x))-\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})(s,Y_s(x))\right|dxds\end{aligned}$$

which are written as I_1^n and I_2^n respectively. Recall that $p\geq 2, q>2$ satisfies (1.3). First by Hölder's inequality (p' is the conjugate number of p),

$$\begin{aligned}I_1^n&\leq\int_0^T\left(\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}1^{p'}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\left|\big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n)-\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})\big)(s,Y_s^n(x))\right|^p dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}ds\\&\leq C_{p,R}\int_0^T\left(\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n)-\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})\big)(s,y)\right|^p\rho_s^n(y)\,dy\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}ds.\end{aligned}$$

Thus by (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_1^n&\leq C'_{p,R}\int_0^T\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n)-\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})\big)(s,y)\right|^p dy\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}ds\\&\leq C'_{p,R,T}\left[\int_0^T\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n)-\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})\big)(s,y)\right|^p dy\right)^{\frac{q}{p}}ds\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\\&=C'_{p,R,T}\left\|\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}^n)-\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})\right\|_{L_p^q(T)}.\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\tilde{b}^n,\tilde{b}$ and Lemma 2.7(ii), we conclude that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}I_1^n=0. \tag{3.14}$$

Now we deal the second term I_2^n. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find $f \in C_c([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}) - f\|_{L_p^q(T)} < \varepsilon$. Then

$$I_2^n \le \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\!\!\int_{B_R} \big|\big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}) - f\big)(s, Y_s^n(x))\big|\, dxds + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\!\!\int_{B_R} \big|\big(f - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{b})\big)(s, Y_s(x))\big|\, dxds$$
$$+ \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\!\!\int_{B_R} \big|f(s, Y_s^n(x)) - f(s, Y_s(x))\big|\, dxds := I_{2,1}^n + I_{2,2}^n + I_{2,3}^n.$$

Analogous to the treatment of I_1^n, we have by Hölder's inequality and the estimate (3.7) that

$$I_{2,1}^n \le C_{p,R}\int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|\big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}) - f\big)(s,y)\big|^p \rho_s^n(y)\, dy\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} ds$$
$$\le C'_{p,R,T}\|\mathrm{div}(\tilde{b}) - f\|_{L_p^q(T)} < C'_{p,R,T}\varepsilon.$$

In the same way, by (3.8), we obtain $I_{2,2}^n < C'_{p,R,T}\varepsilon$. Next the dominated convergence theorem and Proposition 2.8 yield $\lim_{n\to\infty} I_{2,3}^n = 0$. Summarizing these discussions, we get $\lim_{n\to\infty} I_2^n = 0$. Combining this result with the limit (3.14), we obtain the first result.

(ii) We denote by J^n the quantity in the second limit. Similarly we have

$$J^n \le \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\!\!\int_{B_R} \big|\big(\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^*\rangle - \langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma})^*\rangle\big)(s, Y_s^n(x))\big|\, dxds$$
$$+ \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\!\!\int_{B_R} \big|\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma})^*\rangle(s, Y_s^n(x)) - \langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma})^*\rangle(s, Y_s(x))\big|\, dxds$$

which will be denoted by J_1^n and J_2^n. In the following we shall assume $p > 2$ (which is the case when the dimension $d \ge 2$); in fact, the case $p = 2$ is simpler. Again by triangular inequality,

$$J_1^n \le \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\!\!\int_{B_R} \big|\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n - \nabla\tilde{\sigma}, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^*\rangle(s, Y_s^n(x))\big|\, dxds$$
$$+ \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\!\!\int_{B_R} \big|\langle\nabla\tilde{\sigma}, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n)^* - (\nabla\tilde{\sigma})^*\rangle(s, Y_s^n(x))\big|\, dxds =: J_{1,1}^n + J_{1,2}^n.$$

Since p and q are strictly greater than 2, their conjugate numbers $p', q' < 2$. By Hölder's inequality and (3.7), we have for all $s \in [0,T]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n(s, Y_s^n(x))\big|^{p'} dx \le C_{p,R}\bigg(\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n(s, Y_s^n(x))\big|^p dx\bigg)^{\frac{p'}{p}}$$
$$\le C'_{p,R}\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n(s,y)\big|^p dy\bigg)^{\frac{p'}{p}}.$$

Therefore

$$\int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n(s, Y_s^n(x))\big|^{p'} dx\right)^{\frac{q'}{p'}} ds \le C''_{p,R}\int_0^T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n(s,y)\big|^p dy\right)^{\frac{q'}{p}} ds$$
$$\le C_{p,q,R,T}\|\nabla\tilde{\sigma}^n\|_{L_p^q(T)}^{q'} \tag{3.15}$$

which, by the definition of $\tilde{\sigma}^n$ and Lemma 2.7(iv), is uniformly bounded from above. In view of these discussions, an application of Hölder's inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} J^n_{1,1} &\le \int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \left| \big(\nabla \tilde{\sigma}^n - \nabla \tilde{\sigma}\big)(s, Y^n_s(x)) \right|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \left| \nabla \tilde{\sigma}^n(s, Y^n_s(x)) \right|^{p'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} ds \\ &\le C \int_0^T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \big(\nabla \tilde{\sigma}^n - \nabla \tilde{\sigma}\big)(s, y) \right|^p dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \nabla \tilde{\sigma}^n(s, y) \right|^{p'} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} ds \end{aligned}$$

which, by (3.15) and Lemma 2.7(iv), is less than

$$C \|\nabla \tilde{\sigma}^n - \nabla \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^q_p(T)} \|\nabla \tilde{\sigma}^n\|_{L^q_p(T)} \le \tilde{C} \|\nabla \tilde{\sigma}^n - \nabla \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^q_p(T)}.$$

Consequently, we deduce from Lemma 2.7(ii) that $\lim_{n\to\infty} J^n_{1,1} = 0$. Analogous arguments give us $\lim_{n\to\infty} J^n_{1,2} = 0$. Therefore

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} J^n_1 = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Regarding the estimate of J^n_2, we first find a tensor-valued function $f \in C_c([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d; (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes 3})$ such that $\|\nabla\tilde{\sigma} - f\|_{L^q_p(T)} < \varepsilon$, and then estimate it as below:

$$\begin{aligned} J^n_2 &\le \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{B_R} \left| \big(\langle \nabla\tilde{\sigma}, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma})^* \rangle - \langle f, f^* \rangle \big)(s, Y^n_s(x)) \right| dxds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{B_R} \left| \big(\langle f, f^* \rangle - \langle \nabla\tilde{\sigma}, (\nabla\tilde{\sigma})^* \rangle \big)(s, Y_s(x)) \right| dxds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{B_R} \left| \langle f, f^* \rangle(s, Y^n_s(x)) - \langle f, f^* \rangle(s, Y_s(x)) \right| dxds. \end{aligned}$$

For the last term, the dominated convergence theorem yields that its limit is 0 as $n \to \infty$. The first two terms can be dealt with as for $J^n_{1,1}$, and we conclude that they are bounded by $C\varepsilon$ for some $C > 0$ by the choice of the function f. As a result, $\lim_{n\to\infty} J^n_2 = 0$. Combining this with (3.16), we see that the second limit is also zero.

(iii) Finally, we denote by K^n the quantity in the last limit. By Burkholder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} K^n &\le C \int_{B_R} \mathbb{E} \bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \left| \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s, Y^n_s(x)) - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma})(s, Y_s(x)) \right|^2 ds \bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}} \bigg] dx \\ &\le C_R \bigg(\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \left| \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n)(s, Y^n_s(x)) - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma})(s, Y_s(x)) \right|^2 dxds \bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Cauchy's inequality. It suffices to estimate the term in the big bracket which will be denoted by $\hat{K}^n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K}^n &\le 2 \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \left| \big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n) - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}) \big)(s, Y^n_s(x)) \right|^2 dxds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \left| \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma})(s, Y^n_s(x)) - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma})(s, Y_s(x)) \right|^2 dxds =: \hat{K}^n_1 + \hat{K}^n_2. \end{aligned}$$

Again we assume $p > 2$ in condition (1.3). Then by Hölder's inequality and (3.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K}^n_1 &\le 2 \int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} 1\, dx \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \left| \big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n) - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}) \big)(s, Y^n_s(x)) \right|^p dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} ds \\ &\le C_{p,R} \bigg(\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \big(\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n) - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}) \big)(s, y) \right|^p dy \bigg)^{\frac{2}{p}} ds \\ &\le C_{p,R,q,T} \|\mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma}^n) - \mathrm{div}(\tilde{\sigma})\|^2_{L^q_p(T)} \end{aligned}$$

which, due to Lemma 2.7(ii), goes to 0 as n increases to infinity. The treatment of $\hat{K}_2^n$ is analogous to that of I_2^n, hence we omit it. The proofs are finally completed. □

We are at the position of proving

Proposition 3.5 (Quasi-invariance under the flow Y_t)**.** *For any $t \in [0,T]$, the push-forward $(Y_t)_{\#}\mathbb{L}^d$ of the Lebesgue measure $\mathbb{L}^d$ by the flow Y_t is equivalent to $\mathbb{L}^d$; moreover,*

$$\rho_t(x) := \frac{d(Y_t)_{\#}\mathbb{L}^d}{d\mathbb{L}^d}(x) = \big[\bar{\rho}_t\big(Y_t^{-1}(x)\big)\big]^{-1},$$

where the Radon–Nikodym density $\bar{\rho}_t(x)$ is defined in (3.10)*.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, there is a subsequence still denoted by n such that for $(\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{L}^d)$-almost all (ω, x),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{\rho}_t^n(\omega,x) = \bar{\rho}_t(\omega,x) \quad \text{uniformly in } t\in[0,T].$$

Taking into account the uniform bound proved in Proposition 3.3, we have for any $k \geq 1$ and $R > 0$ that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big|\bar{\rho}_t^n(x) - \bar{\rho}_t(x)\big|^k\, dx = 0. \tag{3.17}$$

Now for any $\varphi, \psi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$, we have $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\big(Y_t^{n,-1}(x)\big)\psi(x)\, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y)\psi\big(Y_t^n(y)\big)\bar{\rho}_t^n(y)\, dy \quad \text{for all } t \leq T.$$

By (3.17) and Proposition 2.8, up to a subsequence, the two sides of the above equality are convergent in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ for any fixed $t \in [0,T]$. Thus we get for $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. ω,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\big(Y_t^{-1}(x)\big)\psi(x)\, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y)\psi\big(Y_t(y)\big)\bar{\rho}_t(y)\, dy. \tag{3.18}$$

Since $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$ is separable, we can find a full set $\Omega_t \subset \Omega$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega_t$, the above identity holds for any $\varphi, \psi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$. Noting that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., $\bar{\rho}_t(y)$ is positive for all $(t,y) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, we finish the proof by applying [19, Lemma 3.4(ii)]. □

Finally we can prove the main result of this paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Fix any $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $X_t = \phi_t^{-1}(Y_t(\phi_0))$, we have $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(X_t(x))\, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\big[\phi_t^{-1}\big(Y_t(\phi_0(x))\big)\big]\, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\big[\phi_t^{-1}\big(Y_t(y)\big)\big]\cdot\big|\det(\nabla\phi_0^{-1}(y))\big|\, dy.$$

Applying Propositions 3.5 and 3.1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(X_t(x))\, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\big(\phi_t^{-1}(x)\big)\rho_t(x)\big|\det\big[\nabla\phi_0^{-1}\big(Y_t^{-1}(x)\big)\big]\big|\, dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y)\rho_t(\phi_t(y))\big|\det(\nabla\phi_t(y))\big|\cdot\big|\det\big[\nabla\phi_0^{-1}\big(Y_t^{-1}(\phi_t(y))\big)\big]\big|\, dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y)\big[\bar{\rho}_t\big(Y_t^{-1}(\phi_t(y))\big)\big]^{-1}\big|\det(\nabla\phi_t(y))\big|\cdot\big|\det\big[\nabla\phi_0^{-1}\big(Y_t^{-1}(\phi_t(y))\big)\big]\big|\, dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. ω, $(X_t)_{\#}Ł^d$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $Ł^d$ with the Radon–Nikodym density

$$K_t(x) := \frac{d(Y_t)_{\#}Ł^d}{dŁ^d}(x) = \big[\bar{\rho}_t\big(Y_t^{-1}(\phi_t(x))\big)\big]^{-1}\big|\det(\nabla\phi_t(x))\big| \cdot \big|\det\big[\nabla\phi_0^{-1}\big(Y_t^{-1}(\phi_t(x))\big)\big]\big|.$$

Noticing that $\bar{\rho}_t$ is positive everywhere and $\nabla\phi_t(x)$ is non-degenerate for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we see that the Radon–Nikodym density $K_t(x)$ is positive for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Consequently, $(X_t)_{\#}Ł^d$ is equivalent to $Ł^d$; in other words, the Lebesgue measure is quasi-invariant under the action of the flow X_t generated by (1.4). □

References

[1] Olga V. Aryasovay, Andrey Yu. Pilipenko, On properties of a flow generated by an SDE with discontinuous drift. *Electron. J. Probab.* 17 (2012), no. 106, 1–20.

[2] Shizan Fang, Dejun Luo, Flow of homeomorphisms and stochastic transport equations. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 25 (2007), 1079–1108.

[3] Shizan Fang, Dejun Luo, Anton Thalmaier, Stochastic differential equations with coefficients in Sobolev spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.* 259 (2010), no. 5, 1129–1168.

[4] E. Fedrizzi, F. Flandoli, Pathwise uniqueness and continuous dependence of SDEs with non-regular drift. *Stochastics* 83 (2011), no. 3, 241–257.

[5] E. Fedrizzi, F. Flandoli, Noise prevents singularities in linear transport equations. *J. Funct. Anal.* 264 (2013), no. 6, 1329–1354.

[6] E. Fedrizzi, F. Flandoli, Hölder Flow and Differentiability for SDEs with Nonregular Drift. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 31 (2013), 708–736.

[7] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, E. Priola, Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Invent. Math.* 180 (2010), no. 1, 1–53.

[8] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, E. Priola, Flow of diffeomorphisms for SDEs with unbounded Hölder continuous drift. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 134 (2010), no. 4, 405–422.

[9] I. Gyöngy, T. Martinez, On stochastic differential equations with locally unbounded drift. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 51(126) (2001), no. 4, 763–783.

[10] N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, Strong solutions of stochastic equations with singular time dependent drift. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 131 (2005), no. 2, 154–196.

[11] H. Kunita, Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[12] Dejun Luo, Quasi-invariance of Lebesgue measure under the homeomorphic flow generated by SDE with non-Lipschitz coefficient. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 133 (2009), no. 3, 205–228.

[13] Dejun Luo, Absolute continuity under flows generated by SDE with measurable drift coefficients. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 121 (2011), no. 10, 2393–2415.

[14] Dejun Luo, Generalized stochastic flow associated to the Itô SDE with partially Sobolev coefficients and its application. Accepted by *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, doi: 10.2422/2036-2145.201208_009.

[15] S.E.A. Mohammed, T. Nilssen, F. Proske, Sobolev Differentiable Stochastic Flows for SDE's with Singular Coefficients: Applications to the Transport Equation. Preprint.

[16] A.J. Veretennikov, On the strong solutions of stochastic differential equations. *Theor. Probability Appl.* 24 (1979), no. 2, 354–366.

[17] Xicheng Zhang, Homeomorphic flows for multi-dimensional SDEs with non-Lipschitz coefficients. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 115 (2005), 435–448.

[18] Xicheng Zhang, Strong solutions of SDES with singular drift and Sobolev diffusion coefficients. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 115 (2005), no. 11, 1805–1818.

[19] Xicheng Zhang, Stochastic flows of SDEs with irregular coefficients and stochastic transport equations. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 134 (2010), no. 4, 340–378.

[20] Xicheng Zhang, Stochastic homeomorphism flows of SDEs with singular drifts and Sobolev diffusion coefficients. *Electron. J. Probab.* 16 (2011), no. 38, 1096–1116.

[21] Xicheng Zhang, Well-posedness and large deviation for degenerate SDEs with Sobolev coefficients. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 29 (2013), no. 1, 25–52.